The New World Translation Under Examination

A Critical-Investigative Analysis Based on Its Own Documents

INTRODUCTION

This study begins from a simple position: that of someone who reads the Holy Scriptures carefully and wants to understand what is written. By personal choice, I do not belong to any religious denomination, and I do not write as a defender of any specific tradition.

Curiosity led me to the New World Translation of the Holy Scriptures (NWT). It is presented by its users, especially by Jehovah's Witnesses, as a translation faithful to the original languages and free of traditional doctrinal influences. That kind of claim cannot be accepted or dismissed without examination. It needs to be verified.
This study was not designed to support or attack a denomination, nor to defend an alternative theological position. Its purpose is to investigate, with method and depth, what is taught, published, and affirmed — both in the biblical text and in the explanatory and doctrinal materials associated with it. The focus is not on reaching quick conclusions, but on following the path of evidence in its entirety.
The investigation is organized into three consecutive blocks, each one building on the last. Skipping ahead undermines the whole thing — this isn't a collection of isolated points, it's a cumulative argument.

A few ground rules that apply throughout:

1. No conclusion will be presented as personal opinion.
2. Every factual claim, textual quotation, or doctrinal description will be accompanied by a verifiable source, preferably with a direct link to the original material.
3. The reader will not be asked to trust the author, but invited to verify each step independently.
4. There will be no accusatory language, nor attribution of bad faith. The method will always be descriptive, analytical, and logical.
5. Other biblical translations and external theological systems will not be used as a standard of correction or as a comparative basis for the New World Translation. When other translations are mentioned, it will only be in a historical-documentary context. The analysis remains, from beginning to end, within the internal coherence of the NWT and the theological system that uses it.

With these rules established, the investigation can proceed in a controlled manner. **Block 1** looks at whether the NWT contradicts itself across its own Scriptures, or holds together internally. **Block 2** goes deeper, examining attributes of Jehovah's nature — not just his functions — that the same translation also applies to Jesus.

Block 3 examines the organization's claim to prophetic authority, its history of dated predictions, the origins of the NWT itself, and doctrines with direct, verifiable consequences in the lives of members.

The conclusion belongs to the reader.

BLOCK 1

External Functions and Prerogatives of Jehovah in the NWT

What he does — actions and functions attributed exclusively to Jehovah and exercised by Jesus

"Creator of All Things"

Jehovah's Declaration: Isaiah 44:24 (NWT)

> *"This is what Jehovah says, your Repurchaser, who formed you from the womb: 'I am Jehovah, who made everything. I stretched out the heavens by myself, and I spread out the earth. Who was with me?'"*

Here, Jehovah presents the act of creation as exclusive, absolute, and unshared. The creation of "everything" is tied directly to his identity, without the participation of any other independent agent.

Statements about Jesus: John 1:1–3 (NWT)

> *"In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was a god. This one was in the beginning with God. All things came into existence through him, and apart from him not even one thing came into existence."*

John 1:3 makes two distinct claims. First: everything came into existence through the Word. Second: nothing — not even one thing — came into existence apart from him. There's no middle ground left open.

Colossians 1:15–17 (NWT)

> *"He is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of all creation; because by means of him all other things were created... All other things were created through him and for him."*

Even with the interpretive insertion of the word "other," the NWT assigns to Jesus a creative role that Isaiah describes as exclusive to Jehovah. In the 1984 English edition of the NWT, such insertions appeared in brackets [ ], indicating they were not in the original text. Verifiable in the official introduction of that edition at:
Introduction — Watchtower ONLINE LIBRARY
The word "other" in Colossians 1:16 is one of those insertions. The organization itself acknowledges it isn't in the original — it was added to fill out the meaning. But the addition isn't neutral. It turns an absolute statement into one with a built-in exception, changing the logical category of the sentence entirely. What the Greek says without that word is simply not the same as what it says with it.

In John 1:3, the statement is absolute: not only did all things come into existence through him, but not even one thing came into existence apart from him. In Colossians 1:16–17, the creation is restricted to "all other things," which implies that Jesus would not belong to the set of things he himself created. Both formulations cannot be simultaneously true in the same sense.

"Proverbs 8:22 — The System's Foundational Verse"

Proverbs 8:22 (NWT)

> *"Jehovah produced me as the beginning of his way, the earliest of his achievements of long ago."*

The NWT applies this verse to Jesus, identifying him as Jehovah's first creation. This identification is recorded in an official publication of the organization itself. Verifiable at: Readers' Questions — Watchtower ONLINE LIBRARY

This fact creates a direct tension with John 1:3, already examined: if Jesus is Jehovah's first creation, then he belongs to the set of created things. But John 1:3 states that not even one thing came into existence apart from him. Both statements cannot be true at the same time.

There is an additional tension this verse creates with Isaiah 44:24, where Jehovah declares that he stretched out the heavens "by myself" and asks "who was with me?" If Jesus existed as the first creation before all others, he was present during the creation — which is in direct conflict with Jehovah's declaration that no one was with him. The text offers no resolution to this internal tension.

"Judging All of Humanity"

Prerogative Attributed to Jehovah: Isaiah 33:22 (NWT)

> *"For Jehovah is our Judge, Jehovah is our Lawgiver, Jehovah is our King; he is the one who will save us."*

Genesis 18:25 (NWT)

> *"It is unthinkable for you to act in this manner... Will not the Judge of all the earth do what is right?"*

Judging all humanity is presented as Jehovah's direct prerogative.

Jesus Exercising the Same Function: John 5:22–23 (NWT)

> *"For the Father judges no one at all, but he has entrusted all the judging to the Son, so that all may honor the Son just as they honor the Father."*

This is unambiguous: the Father judges no one; all judgment belongs to the Son; the Son is to receive the same honor as the Father. A prerogative presented as absolute for Jehovah is exercised entirely by Jesus.

Transitional Note
The verses in this block describe actions and functions — creating, judging. Functions, in principle, can be delegated. That argument exists and will be addressed. But there's a different category of attributes: ones that don't describe what Jehovah does, but what he is. Attributes of nature, not function. Those can't be delegated without the concept of identity breaking down entirely. That's what Block 2 examines.

BLOCK 2

Exclusive Internal Attributes of Jehovah in the NWT

What he is — attributes of nature assigned exclusively to Jehovah and applied to Jesus

methodological note:

Isaiah 42:8 (NWT)

> *"I am Jehovah. That is my name; I give my glory to no one else, nor my praise to graven images."*

This isn't a functional statement. It doesn't say Jehovah won't delegate tasks. It says he doesn't share his glory. The question this block examines is whether the NWT itself holds to that exclusivity — or whether it creates tension with it.

"The First and the Last"

Jehovah's Declaration: Isaiah 44:6 (NWT)

> *"This is what Jehovah says, the King of Israel and his Repurchaser, Jehovah of armies: 'I am the first and I am the last. Apart from me there is no God.'"*

Jesus' Declaration: Revelation 1:17–18 (NWT)

> *"Do not be afraid. I am the First and the Last, and the living one, and I became dead, but look! I am living forever and ever, and I have the keys of death and of the Grave."*

The speaker here is clearly identified: Jesus — the one who died and came back to life. The same title Jehovah declared as exclusively his own, tied directly to the claim that no other God exists, is applied to Christ.

"Alpha and Omega"

Revelation 21:6 (NWT)

> *"And he said to me: 'It has come to pass! I am the Alpha and the Omega, the beginning and the end.'"*

The context of verses 5 through 7 of chapter 21 identifies the speaker as the one seated on the throne. The reader is invited to verify directly at:
Revelation 21 — Watchtower ONLINE LIBRARY

Revelation 22:12–16 (NWT)

> *"'Look! I am coming quickly... I am the Alpha and the Omega, the first and the last, the beginning and the end... I, Jesus, sent my angel to bear witness to you...'"*

The speaker identifies himself explicitly as Jesus. The same absolute title, applied without qualification.

"Eternity and Immutability"

Jehovah's Attribute: Psalm 102:25–27 (NWT)

> *"Long ago you laid the foundations of the earth... They will perish, but you will remain... But you are the same, and your years will never end."*

Direct Application to Jesus: Hebrews 1:3–12 (NWT)

> *"He is the reflection of God's glory and the exact representation of his very being... After he had made a purification for our sins, he sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high. So he has become better than the angels, just as the name he has inherited is more excellent than theirs... In the beginning, O Lord, you laid the foundations of the earth... They will perish, but you will remain... But you are the same, and your years will never come to an end."*

Verse 3 deserves attention first. The expression "the exact representation of his very being" translates the Greek term *kharaktêr*, verifiable directly in the organization's own official interlinear: https://www.jw.org/en/library/bible/kingdom-interlinear-greek-translation/

Kharaktêr refers to an impression that is identical to its source — like a seal that perfectly reproduces the thing it marks. This isn't language of resemblance or similarity. It isn't how you'd describe a creature made in someone's image. It's language of identity of nature.

Here a direct tension arises with the organization's own official teaching. The same Watchtower that translates Jesus as "the exact representation of God's very being" in Hebrews 1:3 also publishes:

"Jesus Christ is the archangel Michael." — The Watchtower, April 1, 2010. Verifiable at: https://www.jw.org/pt/biblioteca/revistas/wp20100401/Jesus-é-o-arcanjo-Miguel/

The question this cross-reference raises is not theological. It is strictly textual: at what point in the Scriptures, within the NWT itself, is an angel described as "the exact representation of God's very being"?

The answer, verifiable by the reader in the NWT text itself, is: never. Angels are described as servants, messengers, and created beings. None of them receives the *kharaktêr* applied to the Son in Hebrews 1:3. The organization uses this language for Jesus and simultaneously identifies Jesus as an angel, without explaining how both statements coexist within the same textual system.

The author of Hebrews then applies to Jesus the text of Psalm 102 which, in the Old Testament, refers explicitly to Jehovah. Verifiable at: https://wol.jw.org/pt/wol/b/r5/lp-t/nwtsty/58/1

There is also the translation variable in Hebrews 1:8. The sentence can be read as "God is your throne" — the NWT's choice — or as "Your throne, O God, is forever," a reading in which the Son is directly called God by the Father. The reader who

consults the organization's own reference link will find their argument for that choice. Two points that emerge from the text itself are worth noting, however:
First, the immediately following verse — Hebrews 1:9 (NWT) — continues the same quotation with the words: *"therefore God, your God, anointed you"*. The text there distinguishes two subjects: "God" and "your God." If the Son is not called God in verse 8, verse 9 loses syntactic coherence — there would be no reason to distinguish "God" from "your God" if the Son had not previously been identified as such.

Second, the organization argues that Hebrews 1:8 is quoting Psalm 45, originally addressed to a human king of Israel, and that the language therefore carries no implication of actual divinity. This is a serious argument and deserves acknowledgment. The organization itself cites scholar B. F. Westcott in support of this reading. In the original Watchtower publication, Westcott is quoted as follows:

"It is difficult to think that Elohim in the original was addressed to the king... On the whole, therefore, it seems best to adopt the rendering in the first clause: God is thy throne (or, thy throne is God), i.e., 'Thy kingdom is founded on God.'"

Verifiable at: https://wol.jw.org/pt/wol/d/r5/lp-t/1984169

This is a legitimate academic position, and an honest investigation can't ignore it.

However, it runs into an internal problem posed by the NWT text itself: if the Psalm 45 quotation is only honorific language for a human king — carrying no implication of divine nature — then it doesn't actually prove that Jesus is superior to angels, which is the entire point Hebrews 1 is making. The whole chapter is a progressive demonstration of Jesus's superiority over angels. If the citations are merely ceremonial and say nothing about nature, the argument in Hebrews collapses at its own stated purpose. The text only works as a demonstration if the citations say something real about who Jesus is.

The textual debate over Hebrews 1:8 can be verified in the organization's own publication at: https://wol.jw.org/pt/wol/d/r5/lp-t/1984169

A Note Worth Recording

The organization cites B. F. Westcott to support its reading of Hebrews 1:8. That's a legitimate methodological choice — Westcott is a serious scholar, and his analysis deserves careful consideration. This investigation acknowledges that.

But for that same reason, what Westcott wrote about other key verses deserves equal weight. In the same commentary on the Gospel of John — publicly available at Archive.org — Westcott recorded his position on John 1:1, the verse at the center of the debate over Jesus's identity:

"The predicate (God) stands emphatically first... It is necessarily without the article inasmuch as it describes the nature of the Word and does not identify His Person...

No idea of inferiority of nature is suggested by the form of expression, which simply affirms the true deity of the Word."

B. F. Westcott, The Gospel According to St. John: The Greek Text with Introduction and Notes. Verifiable at: https://archive.org/details/TheGospelAccordingToSt.JohnTheGreekTextWithIntroductionAndNotes

In plain terms: Westcott says the absence of the article in John 1:1 doesn't indicate inferiority of nature — it describes the nature of the Word, and the expression affirms the true deity of the Logos.

The methodological question this raises is straightforward: if Westcott's argument is valid and worth citing in Hebrews 1:8, his analysis of John 1:1 deserves the same treatment. An academic source can't be authoritative only where it's convenient. Citing Westcott selectively — where he supports the doctrine, ignoring him where he contradicts it — is the same pattern already identified in this investigation in the case of Benjamin Kedar-Kopf.

The reader can verify both documents and decide for themselves.

"Knowing Hearts"

Jehovah's Exclusivity: Jeremiah 17:10 (NWT)

> *"I, Jehovah, am searching the heart, examining the innermost thoughts, to give to each one according to his ways."*

Attribute Exercised by Jesus: Revelation 2:18–23 (NWT)

> *"'These are the things that the Son of God says... all the congregations will know that I am the one who searches the innermost thoughts and hearts, and I will give to each one of you according to your deeds.'"*

Jesus claims a function the Old Testament attributes exclusively to Jehovah. The language isn't similar — it's identical.

"The Source of Life"

Jehovah's Declared Exclusivity: Psalm 36:9 (NWT)

> *"For with you is the source of life; by your light we can see light."*

The Same Attribute Applied to Jesus: John 5:26 (NWT)

> *"For just as the Father has life in himself, so he has granted also to the Son to have life in himself."*

The text establishes a direct equivalence of attribute: just as the Father has life in himself, the Son has life in himself. The usual interpretive escape is the word "granted." But that solution does not resolve the problem — it merely shifts it. The question is not whether or not a granting took place. The question is what was granted. The text does not say the Father grants life to the Son, which would be expected for any creature that receives life from an external source. The text says

the Father granted to the Son to have life in himself: the possession of the same attribute Jehovah possesses. After this granting, the Son is not described as dependent on anything. He comes to have life in himself — exactly the same formulation used for Jehovah. Creatures do not have life in themselves; they receive life. John 5:26 does not use that language for the Son.

"Worship Directed at the Son"

The NWT itself establishes that faithful spiritual creatures refuse worship:
Revelation 22:8–9 (NWT)

> *"I fell down to worship at the feet of the angel who had been showing me these things. But he tells me: 'Be careful! Do not do that!... I am only a fellow slave of yours... Worship God.'"*

The angel refuses immediately and redirects. When the same gesture is directed at Jesus, the pattern changes:

Matthew 28:9 (NWT)

> *"They approached and took hold of his feet and did obeisance to him."*

No correction is made.

The Greek word used in these contexts is proskuneo. The NWT translates this same term differently depending on context — in some cases as "worship," in others as "obeisance." The reader is invited to verify the original terms in the NWT interlinear available at: https://www.jw.org/en/library/bible/kingdom-interlinear-greek-translation/
John 20:28–29 (NWT)

> *"In answer Thomas said to him: 'My Lord and my God!' Jesus said to him: 'Because you have seen me, do you believe? Happy are those who have not seen and yet believe.'"*

The exact meaning of Thomas's words is genuinely debated, and an honest investigation acknowledges that. Some argue it was honorific language, or directed at the Father through Jesus, or an emotional reaction without precise doctrinal weight. Those arguments exist and deserve acknowledgment.

However, the immediate context of the NWT text itself limits the reach of those interpretations. John 20:26–28 records that Jesus was physically present in the room. Thomas saw Jesus, was invited to touch his hands and his side, and then said "My Lord and my God" directly to him. The text leaves no ambiguity about the immediate recipient of those words — they were spoken to Jesus, in person, after direct physical contact. The suggestion that Thomas was addressing the Father through Jesus would require the text to indicate such mediation. It does not.

What the NWT text records unambiguously, however, is not what Thomas meant, but Jesus's behavior in the face of those words: no correction, no redirection, no distinction. The pattern already established by the NWT itself is clear: in Revelation 22:8–9, a faithful angel immediately interrupts a gesture of prostration and says "Worship God." Jesus, confronted with words even more direct than a gesture, does not do the same. This contrast in behavior is in the NWT text and does not depend

on interpreting what Thomas meant. It is an observable fact that remains unexplained within the textual system itself.

"Jesus as the Archangel Michael — The Internal Implications"

The Organization of Jehovah's Witnesses officially teaches that Jesus Christ is the archangel Michael:
"Jesus Christ is the archangel Michael." — The Watchtower, April 1, 2010. Verifiable at: https://www.jw.org/pt/biblioteca/revistas/wp20100401/Jesus-é-o-arcanjo-Miguel/
"The Bible indicates that Michael is another name for Jesus Christ, both before and after his life on earth." — What Does the Bible Really Teach?, chap. 11. Verifiable at: https://www.jw.org/pt/biblioteca/livros/biblia-ensina/quem-e-o-arcanjo-miguel-jesus/
"The biblical evidence indicates that the name Michael applied to God's Son before he left heaven." — Insight on the Scriptures, vol. 2, pp. 393–394. Verifiable at: https://wol.jw.org/pt/wol/d/r5/lp-t/1200003035

When crossed with the textual data already recorded, this identification produces five tensions the NWT text itself doesn't resolve:

Tension 1 — Angels refuse worship. Jesus, identified as an angel, does not.
The NWT has already made clear, in Revelation 22:8–9, that faithful angels refuse worship and explicitly redirect it to God. This pattern is consistent with the nature of a creature: it does not accept what belongs exclusively to the Creator. If Jesus is the archangel Michael — and therefore an angel — the same behavior should apply to him. But the data already examined shows the opposite: in Matthew 28:9, Jesus receives prostration without making any correction. In John 20:28, he receives the declaration "My Lord and my God" and responds only by commending Thomas's faith, without redirecting worship to Jehovah. The pattern of faithful angels does not apply to Jesus within the NWT itself.

Tension 2 — Michael acts with limited authority. Jesus receives total authority of judgment.
Jude 9 (NWT) records that Michael, when confronting Satan himself, did not dare to pronounce judgment on his own and said: "May Jehovah rebuke you." The text is explicit: Michael did not act on his own authority. He deferred judgment to Jehovah. That is the expected behavior of a creature before a prerogative that belongs exclusively to the Creator. But John 5:22 (NWT) states: "For the Father judges no one at all, but he has entrusted all the judging to the Son." A being who, when confronting Satan, does not dare to pronounce judgment on his own and defers that prerogative to Jehovah, cannot be the same being to whom all authority of judgment over humanity has been entrusted. The two descriptions do not describe the same agent with the same nature.

Tension 3 — Michael is a creature. John 1:3 requires that the Word not be created.
If Jesus is Michael — an angelic creature, however exalted — then Jesus belongs to the set of created things. But John 1:3 (NWT) says not even one thing came into existence apart from the Word. As shown in Block 1, this logically requires that the Word itself not be created — you can't create yourself, and the text says nothing exists outside the Word's mediation. A created being can't be the universal agent of all creation without John 1:3 becoming meaningless. The two positions — Jesus is

Michael, a creature, and Jesus is the Word, through whom all things came into existence — are mutually exclusive within the NWT.

Tension 4 — Angels receive life. Jesus has life in himself.
John 5:26 (NWT) says the Son has life in himself — the same language used to characterize Jehovah as the source of life. As noted in Block 2, this is a statement about nature, not function. Creatures don't have life in themselves — they receive it. Angels are creatures. So if Jesus is an angel, he can't have life in himself in the sense John 5:26 describes. Yet the NWT makes exactly that claim, using the same language as Jehovah, without qualification. The text doesn't say the Son continuously receives life — it says he possesses life in himself. That's incompatible with the nature of an angelic creature.

Tension 5 — The very meaning of the name creates an internal question.
The organization records that the name Michael means "Who is like God?" — a rhetorical question which, in the Hebrew context, means: no one.
Verifiable at: https://wol.jw.org/pt/wol/d/r5/lp-t/1200003035
But the NWT itself applies to Jesus the titles that Isaiah 44:6 ties to Jehovah's exclusive identity: "I am the first and I am the last. Apart from me there is no God." The being whose name asks "who is like God?" receives, within the same translation, the titles that define who God is.

Final Investigative Note of Block 2
The NWT explicitly states in Isaiah 42:8 that Jehovah doesn't share his glory with anyone. The pattern the investigation has recorded is this: the same translation systematically assigns to Jesus the titles, attributes, and prerogatives that define that glory — without correction, without qualification, without any categorical distinction. The question this pattern raises is strictly logical, and it's the entry point for Block 3.

All cited verses are available for direct verification at:
Bible — Watchtower ONLINE LIBRARY

BLOCK 3

From Texts to Authorities: The Analysis of Official Teachings

Up to this point, the investigation has stayed focused on the NWT's own text. Now that recurring tensions have been identified, the next step isn't to keep repeating them — it's to ask why they persist, how the organization officially explains them, and what else it teaches and publishes, including doctrines with direct, verifiable consequences in the lives of its members.

Biblical texts don't exist in a vacuum. They're read, taught, and interpreted within real institutional structures. That's where the defining question gets answered: does the text govern the doctrine, or does the doctrine govern the text?

The Watchtower's Prophetic Claim Under Its Own Biblical Criterion

The Organization of Jehovah's Witnesses itself has claimed, in official publications, the role of God's collective "prophet" on earth:

> *"This 'prophet' was not one man, but a body of men and women. It was the small group of footstep followers of Jesus Christ, known at that time as International Bible Students. Today they are known as Jehovah's Christian Witnesses."*

verifiable at:‘They Will Have to Know That a Prophet Was Among Them’ — Watchtower ONLINE LIBRARY

This claim changes everything about how the organization's interpretive failures should be evaluated. When an institution claims prophetic authority, its mistakes can no longer be written off as ordinary human error. They have to be examined against the very standard the organization itself says applies.

Deuteronomy 18:22 (NWT)

> ***"When the prophet speaks in the name of Jehovah and the word is not fulfilled or does not come true, then Jehovah did not speak that word."***

That's the standard that will be applied below — not imposed from outside, but drawn from the biblical criterion the Watchtower itself recognizes, explains, and applies to others.

Documented Chronology of Dated Predictions

1914
Before 1914, the Watchtower taught that year would mark the definitive end of human governments:

> *"The 'battle of the great day of God Almighty' (Revelation 16:14) will end in A.D. 1914 with the complete overthrow of earth's present rulership."*

Studies in the Scriptures, vol. 2, 1914 edition, p. 101. Verifiable at: https://archive.org/details/studies-in-the-scriptures-vol.2-the-time-is-at-hand-edition-1914

The organization also stated this date was not open to revision:

> *"We see no reason for changing the figures — nor could we change them if we would. They are, we believe, God's dates, not ours."*

Zion's Watch Tower, July 15, 1894, p. 226. Verifiable at: 1894 Zion's Watch Tower : Watchtower Bible and Tract Society : Free Download, Borrow, and Streaming : Internet Archive

The events announced for 1914 did not occur as described.

1915 and 1918

After 1914 failed to match what had been announced, the date was quietly adjusted to 1915 in later editions of the same work. Verifiable at: https://archive.org/details/studies-in-the-scriptures-vol.2-the-time-is-at-hand-edition-1914

In 1917, the organization taught that God would destroy the churches and their members in 1918:

> *"In the year 1918, when God destroys the churches wholesale and the church members by millions..."*

The Finished Mystery, 1917, p. 485. Verifiable at: https://archive.org/details/TheFinishedMystery

That didn't happen either.

1925

> *"1925 shall mark the resurrection of the faithful worthies of old, such as Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and the faithful prophets of old."*

Millions Now Living Will Never Die, 1920, p. 97. Verifiable at: Millions Now Living Will Never Die : J.F. Rutherford : Free Download, Borrow, and Streaming : Internet Archive

None of that happened.

1975 — The Explicit Expectation and Its Consequences

> *"According to reliable Bible chronology, Adam and Eve were created in 4026 B.C.E., meaning that the sixth thousand-year period of man's existence will end in 1975, with the seventh thousand-year period of human history to begin in the fall of 1975 C.E."*

verifiable at: The Removal of Mankind's Chief Disturber — Watchtower ONLINE LIBRARY

The organization later acknowledged that the 1975 expectation led members to make real, life-altering decisions. Verifiable in the official acknowledgment at: Choosing the Best Way of Life — Watchtower ONLINE LIBRARY

The "1914 Generation" as a Declared Time Limit

"The facts show that this is a limited period, with a definite beginning and a definite end. It began in 1914... There are still people alive who were alive in 1914... 'This generation will by no means pass away until all these things occur.'"

Verifiable directly on the WOL at: The Last Days of This Wicked System of Things — Watchtower ONLINE LIBRARY

The Watchtower's own reference work set explicit limits on what "generation" means:

> *"When the term 'generation' is used with reference to people of a particular time... the life span of such persons would fall within reasonable limits... perhaps 70 or 80 years."*

Verifiable at: Generation — Watchtower ONLINE LIBRARY

Under those parameters, the deadline would have extended to around 1994. After that point passed:

“Jehovah's people, eagerly desiring to see the end of this wicked system, have sometimes speculated about when the “great tribulation” would break out, even relating this to calculations of the life span of a generation from 1914.”

Verifiable at:It Is Time to Be Alert — Watchtower ONLINE LIBRARY

Redefinition of the Concept of "Generation"
Once the deadline passed, the term was reattached to a specific group of anointed ones:

"As a group, these anointed ones make up the modern-day 'generation' of contemporaries that will not pass away... Can we determine the length of this period?... We cannot pinpoint the exact length of this period."

Verifiable directly on the WOL at: What Does the Presence of Christ Mean for You? — Watchtower ONLINE LIBRARY

A concept defined as a generation lasting 70 to 80 years became, after the expectation failed, a period of indefinite and unspecifiable length. This isn't revision with an acknowledgment of error — it's an ad hoc redefinition designed to keep the institutional framework intact.

Investigative Questions Arising from the Documents Themselves

How does the organization itself define the conduct of false prophets?

> *"Jehovah... will put all false prophets to shame either by not fulfilling the false prediction... False prophets will try to hide their reasons for feeling shame, namely, their failure to speak in Jehovah's name."*

Paradise Restored to Mankind — By Theocracy!, 1972, p. 354.
Paradise Restored to Mankind—By Theocracy! (Book) — Watchtower ONLINE LIBRARY
available for download at Archive.org:
https://archive.org/details/paradiserestored0000theo

How did the Watchtower respond to the accusation of false prophecy?

> *"Jehovah's Witnesses... have made errors in their understanding of what would occur at the end of certain time periods. But in making such mistakes they have not... claimed that their predictions were "in the name of Jehovah.""*

Awake!, March 22, 1993, p. 4. Verifiable at:
Why So Many False Alarms? — Watchtower ONLINE LIBRARY

This statement is in direct tension with what the same organization had published in 1972: "This 'prophet' was... the people known today as Jehovah's Christian Witnesses." And with the criterion the organization itself had established for others:
Verifiable at: **False Prophets Today — Watchtower ONLINE LIBRARY**

> **"Does the nonfulfillment of these predictions prove that those who made them were false prophets in accord with Deuteronomy 18:20-22?"**

Verifiable at: Why So Many False Alarms? — Watchtower ONLINE LIBRARY

Who Translated the New World Translation?

The NWT was produced by a committee working under the Watch Tower Society's direct authority. The organization chose to keep its members anonymous.
Verifiable source regarding the anonymity: New World Bible Translation Committee — Watchtower ONLINE LIBRARY
Second verifiable source: New World Translation — Watchtower ONLINE LIBRARY
Despite that anonymity, historical records and sworn testimony allow us to identify the main individuals: Frederick William Franz, Nathan Homer Knorr, Albert D. Schroeder, George D. Gangas, and Milton G. Henschel. The official transcript of the Walsh Trial, in which Frederick W. Franz is identified and examined under oath, is available at: https://archive.org/details/WalshTrial

Of these, only Franz claimed any formal knowledge of biblical languages. That claim was tested during the Walsh Trial (Scotland, 1954), when Franz stated under oath that he knew Hebrew — and then couldn't translate Genesis 2:4 when the attorney asked him to. The official transcript is available at: Walsh Trial : Free Download, Borrow, and Streaming : Internet Archive

This doesn't in itself prove doctrinal error. What it establishes is more basic: the NWT wasn't produced by a committee meeting the usual academic standards for biblical translation. It was produced by religious leaders who were directly committed to a specific doctrinal system.

There's also a documentable case of imprecise use of a scholarly source. Israeli Hebraist Benjamin Kedar-Kopf was cited by the Watchtower as positively endorsing the NWT. Kedar-Kopf later clarified he had never endorsed the translation as a whole — his comments were specific and taken out of context. The reader can verify the exact limits of that citation in the organization's reference material: New World Translation — Watchtower ONLINE LIBRARY

The Textual Basis and Translation Choices

The NWT's New Testament was built primarily on the critical Greek text of Brooke Foss Westcott and Fenton John Anthony Hort (1881). This matters: the textual foundation of the NWT is neither sectarian nor anti-Trinitarian. Westcott was a bishop of the Anglican Church; Hort was a member of the same denomination. Neither produced their work with any intent to deny the divinity of Christ.

Sources:
— B. F. Westcott, The Gospel According to St. John:
The Gospel According to St. John: The Greek Text with Introduction and Notes : Brooke Foss Westcott : Free Download, Borrow, and Streaming : Internet Archive
— F. J. A. Hort, Life and Letters of Fenton John Anthony Hort, vol. 1:
https://archive.org/details/LifeAndLettersOfFentonJohnAnthonyHortVol.1ArthurHort1896

This shifts the focus of inquiry to where it actually belongs: not the Greek text itself, but the translation choices made from it. How does a translation built on a Trinitarian textual foundation consistently arrive at anti-Trinitarian conclusions, especially in theologically sensitive passages?

Two examples verifiable by the reader:

Example 1 — John 1:1
Greek text (as per the NWT's official interlinear): καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος
NWT translation: "the Word was a god"
The Greek text itself contains no indefinite article — Koine Greek does not have that element. The insertion of "a" is a translation choice, not a requirement of the text. The reader can verify the Greek directly in the official interlinear: Kingdom Interlinear | Books of the Bible

Example 2 — John 8:58
Greek text: πρὶν Ἀβραὰμ γενέσθαι ἐγώ εἰμι
NWT translation: "Before Abraham came into existence, I have been."
The verbal form ἐγώ εἰμι is in the present indicative: "I am." The NWT opts for a reformulation in the past tense that avoids that direct reading. The choice affects the identity Jesus claims for himself in this verse.

The Name "Jehovah" in the New Testament

The NWT inserts the name "Jehovah" 237 times in the New Testament. In the corresponding verses, the Greek text — including the interlinear available on the

organization's own website — uses the word Kyrios, meaning "Lord." Verifiable at: Kingdom Interlinear | Books of the Bible

The word "Jehovah" does not appear in any of the more than 5,000 known Greek manuscripts of the New Testament. This fact is acknowledged even by researchers who have evaluated the NWT positively in other respects. Researcher Jason BeDuhn classified the insertion of the name "Jehovah" in the New Testament as a "conjectural emendation" — an alteration of the text based on supposition, not on manuscript evidence. Source: Jason BeDuhn, Truth in Translation, 2003. Verifiable at: https://books.google.com/books?id=EgnIp2Bzdi8C"

The organization justifies the insertion by pointing to medieval Hebrew versions of the New Testament — documents produced between the 14th and 19th centuries, centuries after the original Greek manuscripts. Verifiable at: New World Translation — Watchtower ONLINE LIBRARY

In many of those 237 verses, the immediate context of the New Testament indicates that Kyrios refers to Jesus. By systematically replacing Kyrios with "Jehovah" in those contexts, the NWT redirects the referent from Jesus to Jehovah. One verifiable example:

Romans 10:9–13 (NWT)

> *"...if you publicly declare with your mouth that Jesus is Lord... you will be saved... For 'everyone who calls on the name of Jehovah will be saved.'"*

Verse 9 uses Kyrios referring to Jesus as "Lord." Verse 13 uses the same Kyrios, but the NWT translates it as "Jehovah." The same Greek term, in the same paragraph, is translated differently depending on whom it refers to. This inconsistency is systematic, and its effect is to separate, at the textual level, what the original Greek presents in a unified way.

The Blood Transfusion Prohibition

The blood transfusion prohibition is one of the organization's most well-known teachings, and one with the most direct, verifiable consequences in members' real lives. It will be examined the same way everything else in this investigation has been: what is the textual claim, what does the text actually say, when was the doctrine formulated, and what does the historical record show about internal inconsistencies?

The Alleged Textual Basis

The prohibition rests on three main passages:

Genesis 9:4 (NWT): "Only flesh with its life — its blood — you must not eat."
Leviticus 17:14 (NWT): "...you must not eat the blood of any sort of flesh, because the life of every sort of flesh is its blood."
Acts 15:28–29 (NWT): "...to abstain... from blood..."

The investigative question is strictly textual: what do these verses actually prohibit?

The Hebrew verb used in Genesis 9:4 and Leviticus 17:14 is **akhal** — meaning to eat, to consume by mouth. The context of both verses is dietary: regulations regarding the ingestion of animal flesh. Blood transfusion is not ingestion. Physiologically, a transfusion introduces blood directly into the bloodstream, where it functions as blood — it is not digested, metabolized as food, or passed through the gastrointestinal system. The very terms of the text do not describe that process.

Acts 15:28–29 appears in the context of the Jerusalem Council, where the apostles established guidelines for Gentile believers. The text says to "abstain from blood," but the immediate context lists this instruction alongside "abstaining from things sacrificed to idols" and "from sexual immorality" — all clearly in the context of cultic and moral practices, not of medical procedures unknown in the first century C.E. Blood transfusion as a medical practice did not exist in that historical period.
Verifiable at: https://www.jw.org/pt/biblioteca/biblia/biblia-estudo/livros/atos/15/

When the Doctrine Was Formulated
The organization has existed since 1870. Blood transfusion has existed as a medical procedure since the 17th century. Yet the specific prohibition against transfusion only appeared in July 1945, in an article in The Watchtower (July 1, 1945, pp. 198–201).

This fact is confirmed by multiple independent academic sources, including an article published in the peer-reviewed journal Social Science & Medicine: "Since 1945, the Watch Tower Society has instructed its followers to refuse transfusions of whole blood and certain blood components." Source: Singelenberg R., Social Science & Medicine, 1990. Available at: The blood transfusion taboo of Jehovah's Witnesses: Origin, development and function of a controversial doctrine - ScienceDirect

A review article published in the open-access journal BMC Medical Ethics confirms: "The church organisation, the Watchtower Society, introduced the policy on refusal of blood in 1945." Source: Bioethical aspects of the recent changes in the policy of refusal of blood by Jehovah's Witnesses - PMC

The methodological question this raises is precise: if the Genesis, Leviticus, and Acts verses existed from the organization's founding in 1870, and transfusion had been a known medical procedure for centuries, why does the specific prohibition only appear in 1945 — more than 75 years after the movement began?

The Revision Timeline — The Internal Contradiction
Since 1945, the doctrine has gone through a series of revisions that are themselves investigatively significant:

1961 — The organization begins applying the penalty of disfellowshipping (expulsion) for members who accept transfusions.
Verifiable at: https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC1119307/
1967 — Organ transplants are prohibited as "cannibalism."
Verifiable in the organization's own publication at: Readers' Questions — Watchtower ONLINE LIBRARY

1980 — Organ transplants are permitted again, without explicit acknowledgment of the prior error. Verifiable at: Readers' Questions — Watchtower ONLINE LIBRARY

From the 1990s onward — Blood fractions (albumin, immunoglobulins, hemoglobin) are progressively permitted as individual "conscience decisions." Verifiable at:Readers' Questions — Watchtower ONLINE LIBRARY

2000 — The organization issues a directive declaring it will no longer formally initiate the disfellowshipping process for accepting a transfusion, though a member who accepts one "indicates that he no longer wishes to be one of Jehovah's Witnesses." Verifiable at: https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC1119307/

The internal logical contradiction is precise: if the principle is that blood is sacred and cannot be used because Scripture so determines, why are fractions of that same blood permitted as a personal choice? Fractionated blood is the same blood. The line between "prohibited" and "permitted" does not come from the text — it comes from successive institutional decisions that subsequently seek support in the same verses.

Real-Life Consequences
This isn't abstract. Children have died. Adults have refused treatment and died. Courts in multiple countries have been called to weigh religious autonomy against the protection of life, especially for minors.

A review article published in the journal Postgraduate Medical Journal, accessible via PubMed Central, examines the ethical and legal aspects of these situations in an international context: Ethical and legal aspects of refusal of blood transfusions by Jehovah's Witnesses, with particular reference to Italy - PMC

The Two-Witness Policy and Child Sexual Abuse

Within the congregational structure of Jehovah's Witnesses, cases of alleged serious sin — including sexual abuse — are handled internally by a judicial committee composed exclusively of male elders. This system does not report cases to civil authorities, but treats the matter as a spiritual issue to be resolved within the congregation. For an allegation to progress in this system, the organization applies the two-witness principle, derived from Deuteronomy 19:15 (NWT):

"On the testimony of two witnesses or three witnesses the matter should be established."

This means in practice: if a child alleges having been abused by a member of the congregation, and the accused denies it, and there is no second eyewitness to the abuse — which is nearly universally the case, as child sexual abuse occurs precisely in private — the allegation cannot proceed in the internal system. The case is closed and, in the organization's own terminology, left "in Jehovah's hands."

The Textual Basis and Its Original Context

Deuteronomy 19:15 appears in the context of civil legal disputes between adults in ancient Israelite society. The verse is about establishing guilt in general conflicts between adult community members — not sexual crimes against children, a category where a second witness almost never exists by the nature of the crime. Applying a rule designed for adult civil disputes to situations where the only possible witness is the child itself doesn't come from the text — it comes from an institutional interpretive decision.

The Australian Royal Commission itself, when examining this practice, noted that the rule *"was formulated more than 2,000 years ago"* and that its inflexible application to child sexual abuse cases demonstrates *"a serious failure to understand the nature of child sexual abuse."* Verifiable at: https://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/media-releases/report-jehovahs-witness-organisations-released

What the Historical Record Documents

In 2015, the Australian government established the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse — a formal public investigation conducted under oath, with court-equivalent powers. Case Study No. 29 specifically examined Jehovah's Witnesses. The findings are available in the official document at: https://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/case-studies/case-study-29-jehovahs-witnesses

The documented findings include:

— The organization held internal files with records of sexual abuse allegations involving 1,006 members over decades. Of those 1,006 cases, not one had been reported to police by the organization's leadership. The Commission referred information about 514 alleged perpetrators directly to police. Verifiable at: https://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/media-releases/report-jehovahs-witness-organisations-released

— The Commission concluded that *"children are not adequately protected from the risk of child sexual abuse in the Jehovah's Witnesses organisation"* and that the organization *"does not respond adequately to allegations of child sexual abuse."* Verifiable at: https://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/media-releases/report-jehovahs-witness-organisations-released

— The internal disciplinary system conducted by the elders is not oriented toward the protection of the child or the survivor. Penalties are weak, with little consideration given to the risk of reoffending by the perpetrator. The victim has little or no choice over how their complaint is handled.

— After receiving the Commission's recommendations — including the revision of the two-witness policy in child abuse cases — the organization refused to modify its position, declaring that it considers the Scriptures to prohibit any change in the application of the rule. Verifiable at: https://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/media-releases/report-jehovahs-witness-organisations-released

The Tension with the Biblical Text the Organization Itself Uses

The same organization that applies Deuteronomy 19:15 inflexibly in cases of child abuse uses the teachings of Jesus as the moral foundation of its system. Jesus, in the Gospels recorded in the NWT itself, is presented as especially concerned with the protection of children. Matthew 18:1–6 (NWT) records that Jesus said it would be better for a millstone to be hung around the neck of whoever causes *"one of these little ones."* Verifiable at: https://wol.jw.org/pt/wol/b/r5/lp-t/nwtsty/40/18

Disfellowshipping — Institutional Control and Textual Basis

Disfellowshipping — the formal expulsion of a member — is presented as grounded in specific biblical texts. Its practical reach, however, goes well beyond what those texts describe.

The Alleged Texts

1 Corinthians 5:11–13 (NWT): *"...stop keeping company with anyone called a brother who is sexually immoral or a greedy person... not even eating with such a man... Remove the wicked person from among yourselves."* Verifiable at: https://wol.jw.org/pt/wol/b/r5/lp-t/nwtsty/46/5

2 John 10 (NWT): *"If anyone comes to you and does not bring this teaching, never receive him into your homes..."* Verifiable at: https://wol.jw.org/pt/wol/b/r5/lp-t/nwtsty/63/1

The Investigative Question:

1 Corinthians 5 addresses a specific case of serious sexual immorality in the Corinthian congregation. Paul is responding to a singular, concrete situation. The instruction not to eat with such a person is set within the community of faith — it doesn't extend to cutting off contact with non-member relatives, children, or parents. Paul clarifies this explicitly in the same chapter, verse 10: he's not talking about the world in general.

2 John 10 is specifically about not hosting or greeting teachers who deny the incarnation of Christ — false teachers bringing in doctrinal error from outside. The verse is about protecting the community doctrinally, not about shunning members who question prophetic chronologies or simply decide to leave.

The Practical Extent of the Doctrine

In the organization's application, disfellowshipping is applied in situations that go far beyond what the above texts describe.

Documented situations include:

Apostasy — questioning or rejecting the organization's teachings: The organization itself compares apostate thinking to *"deadly gangrene"* and describes disfellowshipping as the only alternative: *"Cutting off from the Christian congregation*

the one who persists in such disbelief may be the only way to protect others." Verifiable at: ‘Do Not Be Quickly Shaken From Your Reason’ — Watchtower ONLINE LIBRARY

Sexual immorality: *"Those who also commit adultery and are unrepentant are disfellowshipped by the congregations of Jehovah's Witnesses."* Verifiable at: https://wol.jw.org/pt/wol/d/r5/lp-t/1101993015

Simply ceasing to be a Witness: voluntary exit is treated as automatic disassociation, with the same consequences as disfellowshipping. Confirmed in a peer-reviewed BMJ article citing the organization's own official statement: *"both disfellowshipped and disassociated persons are treated as expelled. In both cases, the religious community must shun them."* Verifiable at: https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC1119307/

The Practical Result: Decades of Family Ostracism.

Once expelled, the official instruction was clear: congregation members — including family members not living in the same household — were to avoid the expelled person entirely.

Verifiable at: When a Relative Is Disfellowshipped . . . — Watchtower ONLINE LIBRARY

. The September 15, 1981 Watchtower established this position explicitly: *"We will not keep company with such a person, not even eating with such a one."* Verifiable at: How to View Disfellowshipping — Watchtower ONLINE LIBRARY

This instruction was in force for more than forty years — through the 1980s, 1990s, 2000s, and 2010s. During that time, families were separated in obedience to this policy. Children cut off parents. Parents cut off children. Spouses were left in impossible situations.

In 2023, the organization partially revised this guidance, allowing basic family contact in specific circumstances with expelled relatives. That revision is itself investigatively significant: it confirms that the prior practice existed, was institutional, and affected real families for more than four decades before it was changed.

The question this history raises is the same one that surfaces throughout this investigation: if the practice was problematic enough to revise in 2023, what does that say about the decades it was applied as divine instruction — and about the families destroyed in obedience to it?

The Internal Contradiction

The organization teaches that each person is individually accountable to Jehovah for their decisions. Verifiable at: https://wol.jw.org/pt/wol/d/r5/lp-t/2006206

But the mechanism of disfellowshipping transfers that responsibility to the institution: it is the organization that determines who is "in" and who is "out," and that instructs members — including relatives — on how to treat the expelled. The personal cost of disagreeing or leaving — loss of the entire family and social network

built within the organization — functions as a retention mechanism independent of any theological argument.

The Historical Precedence of Doctrine over Translation — The Complete Pattern

This is the final section. It introduces no new cases — it closes the argument the three blocks have built progressively. Everything examined — the textual tensions of the NWT, the attributes of nature applied to Jesus, the prophetic claim, the failed predictions, the transfusion prohibition, the two-witness policy, the disfellowshipping — all of it converges on a single question that this section answers with historical precision.

The question isn't theological. It's not about which translation is more accurate or which interpretation is correct. It's a simple historical question, answerable with verifiable documents:

Did the New World Translation give rise to the theology of Jehovah's Witnesses — or did the theology of Jehovah's Witnesses give rise to the New World Translation?

The answer changes everything. If the translation came first and the theology developed from it, the system is intellectually honest — debatable, but honest. If the theology came first and the translation was produced to support it, then the system works in the opposite direction from what it claims: the doctrine governs the text, not the other way around.

The Historical and Documentable Answer

The Origin of the Movement — Decades Before the NWT

The organization itself confirms in its online library that its modern history begins in 1870, with Charles Taze Russell and a Bible study group in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania:

"1870 — Charles Taze Russell and associates in Pittsburgh and Allegheny, Pennsylvania, U.S.A., begin systematic study of the Bible." Verifiable at: https://wol.jw.org/en/wol/d/r1/lp-e/1101993046

And confirms that the central theological conclusions were formed in that same period:

"The modern history of Jehovah's Witnesses began more than a hundred years ago. In the early 1870's, a small group of Bible students began a systematic study of the Scriptures in Allegheny, Pennsylvania, U.S.A. ... Charles Taze Russell was the prime mover of the group." Verifiable at: https://wol.jw.org/en/wol/d/r1/lp-e/1102000101

During that period — decades before the NWT existed — the central conclusions were already in place: rejection of the Trinity, denial of Christ's full divinity, identification of Jesus as a created being, the holy spirit as an impersonal force, prophetic chronology with specific dates.

Between 1870 and the mid-20th century, Russell, Rutherford, and the movement's early leaders used the King James Version, the American Standard Version, and other translations produced by Trinitarian scholars. Those translations weren't designed to deny the Trinity. Yet the anti-Trinitarian conclusions were already fully formed. The theology of Jehovah's Witnesses wasn't born from an anti-Trinitarian translation. It was born in spite of the existing translations.

The New World Translation begins to be published only from 1950 onward — the New Testament — with the complete Bible in 1961. The organization itself confirms this: *"In 1950, the New World Translation of the Christian Greek Scriptures was published."* Verifiable at: https://wol.jw.org/pt/wol/d/r5/lp-t/1101990133

That's more than 75 years separating the formation of the movement's core theology from the publication of the translation that now supports it.

The same pattern appears in every doctrine examined in this block:

The blood transfusion prohibition did not exist before 1945 — more than 75 years after the founding of the movement and centuries after the verses that sustain it were written. The doctrine emerges in 1945; the texts of Genesis and Leviticus are then invoked to support it. Confirmed by a peer-reviewed article: https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC1119307/

The two-witness policy applied to sexual abuse does not follow from a natural reading of Deuteronomy 19:15 in context. It follows from an institutional decision to interpret a verse about civil disputes between adults as applicable to sexual crimes against children — with consequences documented by a governmental royal commission in 1,006 cases not reported to police. Verifiable at: https://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/media-releases/report-jehovahs-witness-organisations-released

The concept of the "1914 generation" was defined by the organization itself with a limit of 70 to 80 years, verifiable at: https://wol.jw.org/pt/wol/d/r5/lp-t/1200001648 — then surpassed, then redefined as a "period of indefinite duration," verifiable at: https://wol.jw.org/pt/wol/d/r5/lp-t/2008125 — without acknowledgment of error, only with new terminology.

Disfellowshipping with total family ostracism was applied for more than forty years as official instruction, verifiable at: https://wol.jw.org/pt/wol/d/r5/lp-t/1981688 — and partially revised in 2023, without explicit acknowledgment that families were destroyed by decades of obedience to that policy.

The Flow This Chronology Reveals

The healthy flow in responsible biblical studies is: *text → exegesis → theology*

The observable and documented historical flow in the case of Jehovah's Witnesses is: *theology → re-reading → translation/doctrine → confirmation of the theology*

This doesn't automatically invalidate every verse of the NWT, or every person who reads it sincerely. But it does compromise the translation's claimed neutrality and the organization's authority as the sole interpreter of Scripture — especially when that same organization claims to be the only channel of communication between God and humanity, verifiable at: https://wol.jw.org/pt/wol/d/r5/lp-t/1972241

CLOSING

The Final Question:
Does the New World Translation and the teachings built around it reflect the biblical text — or does it reflect the need to preserve a doctrinal system formulated in the 19th century and consolidated across the 20th?
This investigation doesn't force an answer. It organized the facts, kept the original words, provided verifiable sources, and let the biblical criterion itself — the one the organization acknowledges — do its work.
What each reader does with this belongs to them. But there is a question this evidence leaves open — not about doctrine, not about denomination, but about the very act of believing: Socrates said that the unexamined life is not worth living. Perhaps the same holds for faith. Not because examination destroys, but because what cannot withstand examination was already destroyed before you looked.